, ,



PATENT APPLICATION

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q76217

Kenji TSUKADA

Appln. No.: 10/601,200

Group Art Unit: 2853

Confirmation No.: 6413

Examiner: Ly T. TRAN

Filed: June 23, 2003

For: LIQUID EJECTING APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR CLEANING THE SAME

RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT WITH STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Examiner has identified the application as containing claims directed to three (3) distinct species. The Examiner has required the Applicant to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted. The Examiner believes there are no generic claims. Applicant has been advised that a response to this requirement shall include an identification of the species that is elected and a listing of all claims readable thereon.

Election

In response to the Examiner's requirement, Applicant elects **Species III, Fig. 6** for examination on which claims **8-10** are readable <u>with traverse</u> set forth below.

RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

U.S. Appln. No. 10/601,200

Attorney Docket No.: Q76217

Traversal of the Restriction Requirement with Statement of Substance of the Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courteous telephonic interviews on August 31 and

September 1, 2005. The Statement of Substance of the Interviews is as follows:

Applicant's representative contacted the Examiner on August 31, 2005 to discuss the

Restriction Requirement. Specifically, it was indicated that the restriction requirement is

improper as it excludes claims 11-20. It was further indicated that claims 11-20 can not be read

from the Species I to III. The Examiner agreed to review the Restriction Requirement.

Applicant's representative contacted the Examiner on September 1, 2005 with respect to

the Restriction Requirement. The Examiner agreed that claims 11-20, exemplary embodiment of

which is depicted in Fig. 9, cannot be read from the Species I to III, and should be indicated as a

separate Specie IV. The Examiner indicated that Applicant's representative can elect Specie IV

and requested that this oversight is made of record in response to the Restriction Requirement.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully elects claims 11-20 for prosecution on the merits.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that if any of the elected claims are found to be allowable, claims

dependent therefrom should similarly be considered allowable in the same application.

Applicant reserves the right to file a Divisional Application directed to non-elected

claims.

2

RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

U.S. Appln. No. 10/601,200 Attorney Docket No.: Q76217

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 56,616

Nataliya Dyorson

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Washington office} \\ 23373 \end{array}$

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 2, 2005

Attorney Docket No.: Q76217